A

LETTER

TO

Doctor Bates:

CONTAINING

A Vindication of the Doctor, and my Self,

Neceſſitated by Mr. *W's.* His Anſwer to Mr. *HUMFREY.*

By *S. L.*

He that is firſt in his own Cauſe ſeemeth Right; But His Neighbour cometh, and ſearcheth Him, Prov. 18. 17.

LONDON,
Printed for *Nathaniel Hiller* at the *Prince's-Arms* in *Leaden-Hall-Street*, over againſt St. *Mary-Axe*, 1695.

(8) 28 p.

TO THE
READER.

Reader,

IT is a Story too grievous for me to tell (who am One whoſe Labour in the Work has been none of the leaſt) what hath been tranſacted in bringing the Nonconformiſt Brethren of the London *Miniſtry to an Union; and now upon the Breach, what of late hath been towards a Recovery of it, I have the witneſs of my own Conſcience in the thing, and it were ſome Defiling of it to make my own Relation. Thus much muſt be known upon Neceſſity, that for as much as Dr.* Bates, *Mr.* Howe, *Mr.* Alſop, *Mr.* Mayo *and Mr.* Burgeſſe *with many more had ſubſcribed an* Approbation *to a Book of Mr.* Williams's, *in which ſome Paſſages were excepted againſt by ſome others of* Note *amongſt Us, it was Propoſed in a Meeting of many, and moſt of the Chief of both ſides, that theſe Brethren ſhould withdraw that Approbation; Or draw in, as it were, its Breath ſo long, till thoſe Paſſages might be Examined, whether it was fit ſuch a Teſtimony as theirs ſhould be born to them. Unto this Propoſal, the Brethren Forenamed Prudentially Complied, in granting of theſe three things (only Dr.* Bates *and Mr.* Alſop *were not preſent when the Laſt was Agreed unto.) That the Interpretation of their Approbation ſhould not be Extended beyond the Original Intention. That if there appeared any Errors in his*

Books, they would be ready to Declare against them; And that one of the Brethren ſhould be appointed to Collect thoſe Errors, and bring a Copy thereof to the Brethren to ſcan the matter; which Province was put on me.

This being an Office on which ſo much Depended in Order to Peace, *I could not ſhift it off; and yet very hard to Undertake, becauſe ſo* ungrateful, *to Appear as an* Accuſer, *and ſo* troubleſome *to be an* Opponent, *and ſtand to the Proof of every Error, that I ſhould note for Error. There was but* one way, *how to get out of theſe two Emergent Straits, which was to look into the Books of ſome of the more Eminent of our Brethren, unto whom we pay a Deference in regard to their* Orthodoxie, *and to ſet down their Words (which Mr.* W's. *I count, might not Diſpute) in one* Column, *and Mr.* W's. *his Words in another; and if they be but found Contradictory, my Work, I reckon Effectually Performed; for their Books being put into the Place of the* Accuſer, *and* Opponent, *I Look on my ſelf to be at Liberty, and to be Concerned no farther than that my Quotations be Juſtifiable as Right and Fair; their Teſtimony* ad hominem *being the moſt ſufficient Probation.*

If the Doctrine *of thoſe Reverend Brethren who Subſcribed the fore-mentioned* Approbation *to Mr.* Ws's *Book be found in their* own *Books to be contrary to* that *I have Collected out of* His, *I would fain know what* Medium *can be deviſed by any Man more proper, more* ſufficient *(I ſay) and* effectual *for the making either Mr.* W's *to* retract *what he hath* written, *or thoſe Brethren their* hands *from his Book? This is the very direct Task is put upon me to effect.*

Accordingly I prepared ſuch a Paper, and a Copy thereof was Diſtributed to ſeveral of the aforeſaid Brethren, whereof One of them without any Knowledge or Licenſe of mine, did let Mr. Humfrey *have his Copy (not telling him, who was the*

the Collector) to Read; and he Writing ſome Animadverſions on it, ſent them in a Printed Sheet as a Letter to him; having before Returned his Copy. Upon this Sheet of Mr. Humfrey's, *Mr.* W's. *Prints another in Anſwer to it, and Falls on me, as if I had done him wrong in my Quotations. This Sheet of Mr.* W's. *therefore doth Conſtrain me to Print Likewiſe an Anſwer to him for Vindication of my Self and Dr.* Bates, *upon whom I count, when my Quotations ſhall be found to be true, and that which I have done is only bringing the Drs. Books againſt Mr.* W s, *if any thing ſtick in point of Doctrine, it muſt fall.*

As for Mr. Humfrey, *I have little Reaſon for my Part to* thank *him* for his Animadverſions, *ſeeing any one may perceive in whoſe favour they are written. Nevertheleſs I cannot but take notice what a Spirit Mr.* W's *ſhews himſelf to be of in the Style he uſes towards him. If ever there was a* Philanthropy, *or* Benignity *of mind ſhewn in any Office done to a man of no more acquaintance and concern than there is (ſo far as I know) between theſe two, we have here an Example of it.* Mr. Humfrey *I believe did ſilently think, that the Collector of theſe Objections, and thoſe, that put me upon it, had oppreſſed Mr.* W's, *and therefore getting a Copy did both make and Publiſh his Animadverſions without my knowledge, as I have ſaid, to the very intent, as one may judge, that all might ſee what a little we had to except againſt him. who doth in every Objection, or for the moſt part, go about to cover* Mr. W's; *and where he* cannot, *he tells he had not his Books at preſent by him to examine the Quotations; whereby he does manifeſtly open a door for Mr.* W's *to bring himſelf off; and yet is Mr.* W's *under ſo great a prejudice as to blame Mr.* Humfrey *even for this, that he would Print my Collections*

lections without looking first into his Books, whether they were true or no; whereas if any of them be false, it is that, above any thing, would justifie his Books.

There is no doubt but here was kindness intended, (and a very great kindness in so Grave *and* Peaceable *a Man's appearing as a third Person in his behalf, when one's own justifying himself is look'd upon as vile, and impotent;) and yet do I not see one handsome word of thanks or acknowledgement given him, but, on the contrary, a* sullen disdain, *that he or any should offer to vindicate him but himself; and therefore mentions not any thing of that which* Mr. H. *put in for his* assistance, *(as he deals by Dr.* Bates *mentioning nothing of his) but referrs still to his own Books, of which he has so high a value, that he cannot forbear expressing it, and let us know, that it is for want of* deeper thoughts (viz. *in reading his Books,*) *that I and my Brethren on one side, and Mr.* H. *on the other, do* not see the Truth stated against the excess of *us* both.

I perceive, that what Mr H. *hath said in his Candid Opinion of the Collector at the beginning of his Sheet, tho' he favours Mr.* W's *most in that which follows, hath angred Mr.* W's *very much; but I who am of another mind, must acknowledge that ingenuity and moderation of Mr.* H. *which was long ago known to all the World; and therefore will conclude what I have said of him with the words of the Pious, Learned, and Judicious Mr.* Hickman, *on occasion of some Controversie between them, as seasonably instructive to us in* their *Example.*
" Postquam Schedas hasce ad Umbilicum perduxeram,
" incidi in Librum Reverendi *Johannis Humfreji* in quo ni-
" hil reperio, quod non *Humfreium* Spirat Virum, (scilicet)
" cùm *Eruditum* tùm *Pacis Ecclesiasticæ Studiosissimum.* At
" quàm diversissimè ab illo Sentire sum Coactus è sequen-
" tibus

" tibus Innoteſcet. Sential jam tandem Orbis Chriſtianus
" nos *Præsbyterianos* poſſe placide Diſſentire, & totius rei
" Litem unius Sacræ Scripturæ Arbitrio dirimendam Re-
" linquere.

There are two or three things at the end of Mr. W*'s his Paper that do offend me, becauſe I know there is want of truth in thoſe Reflections; but I reſolve (at leaſt at preſent) to forbear any other Narration, becauſe I ſee no good like to come of it. That which I attend, and am to attend, is my* Quotations, *and having made others beſides theſe in reference to Mr.* Howe, *and Mr.* Alſop*'s Books, as well as Dr.* Bates, *I purpoſely wave them, to try Mr.* W*'s firſt with Dr.* Bates. *If He yield to the Doctor, it is an Engagement unto us all, and we ſhall preſently come to a* Compoſition *with him: If he will not yield to him, neither will he yield to the reſt; and then if he will not yield to us, he may depart from us, and we ſhall come to a Compoſition without him. So that either with him, or without him, according to the moſt Chriſtian Reſolution of ſome Worthy Brethren of both Perſwaſions (ſo far as I can do it)* we will come to a Compoſition:

Stephen Lobb.

ERRATA:

ERRATA.

BE pleas'd to Correct with your Pen the following *Errata*, occasioned by the mistake of the Printer.

Page 3. *line* 1, 2, 6. for *their*, read *your*. *Page* 4. *line* 16. for *in*, read *us*. *Page* 16. *line* 17. for *Then*, read *When*.

To the Reverend Dr. BATES.

Honoured and Reverend Sir,

THE Aſſurance you gave me of Mr. *W*'s. his Diſpoſition to *Peace*, and his *Agreement* with your ſelf in *Doctrinals*, greatly rejoyced me, animating my hopes, that our Endeavours, through the Grace of God, might end in an obtaining the much deſired *Coalition*; but meeting with a ſheet laſt *Munday* under Mr. *W*'s. his own Name, I ſaw in it enough to weaken my hopes.

The ſheet contains an Anſwer to thoſe things, I did, on the deſire of ſome Worthy Brethren, collect out of his Writings, which was done with an honeſt Deſign (God knows) to *Reſtore Peace*, and *Secure Truth*, in which I did, without the leaſt Bitterneſs, only make a naked Report of what, I Judged was in his Writings, Diſſonant from yours and ſome others; and gave a Copy of it unto you, that after an Examination, you might, as you ſaw Cauſe, faithfully, and according to your wonted Candor deal with Mr. *W*'s. about it.

But my *Affectionate*, and *Peaceable* Deſign is Interpreted to be *Malicious*, and *Dividing*. He thus expreſſes himſelf to Mr. *Humfrey*. 'Will your Experience allow you to be a Tool to a 'Man, you call Learned, becauſe Induſtrious to *Divide* Brethren, 'under a Pretence of reconciling a Breach, which is made, and 'maintained to ſerve a Turn, againſt all the Self-Denying Me'thods, that were poſſible on our Part. Elſewhere, He Complaineth of being *Unjuſtly* Repreſented, and of the Objector's *Malice*. p. 7.

Beſides, His Entire Agreement with you he Repreſenteth thus; *You will find Dr.* Bates, *Mr.* How, *and Mr.* Alſop, *Deſign no more than what's Agreeable to what I Affirm*, &c. Not that he Deſcends to Agree with You, but You with him, tho' it's now more Conſpicuous, That He differs from you in Points of Mo-

ment,

ment, and instead of having this matter Privately and Amicably Concerted by your Self, Mr. *How*, and some other Worthy Brethren, he seems by this Paper to turn from you, and Appeal to the *Publick*, suggesting in a *Minatory Style*, that if the Subscribers should *Abate their Testimony* to his Book, they would be *False to Truth*, and their Ministry; *That men will Judge*, the Presbyterians cause *these Divisions*, *And the* English *and* Forreign *Churches would affix* the Crispian Dotages to Presbyterians.

By these, and divers other Passages, you may guess somewhat at Mr. *W*'s his Drift and Design; But I will only Offer what, I humbly think, is sufficient to Evince, that I *have not misrepresented him.* I am sure I never *Intended* any such thing, but undertook what I did with a Firm Resolution of giving Mr *W*'s uttermost satisfaction, if he could convince me, I had, in any one instance, made a Misreport of his Writings. *Only*, I must Beseech you to consider, that the *Paper* I read to the Brethren, of which a *Copy* was sent you, was only an *Abstract* of Larger Writings by me.

This *Premised*, I will with the most Candor I can, examine what Mr. *W*'s saith in his own Vindication.

Mr. *W*'s.

1. "Christ *where* he is called a *Surety*, was a *Surety* of the "*Better Testament*, and therefore not of the *Law of Works*. It "was not the Covenant that obliged Us to die for Sin, or perfectly Obey in a way of Merit, that he is called a *Surety of*, "Man made Righteous. *p.* 102. *Answ.* He leaves out the Word *Here*, and so changes the Sense. "My Words are, That the "Covenant, he is call'd a Surety of *Here*, viz. *Heb.* 7. 22.

S. L.

That the Word [*Here*] escaped the Pen of the Transcriber I can't help, nor am much troubled at it, when I consider, the Whole of its Import is in the foregoing Words so Expresly Delivered, as to prevent a *Change of the Sense*, thus, "*Christ*, "where he is *call'd* a *Surety*, *is a Surety of the Better Testament*, which must Refer to *Heb.* 7. 22. seeing he is no where else called Surety.

Surety; And ~~their~~ your Preſent urging it with ſo much Concernment, makes it manifeſt, it's ~~their~~ your ſtated Judgment, that, *Heb.* 7. 22. *Doth not ſpeak of a Surety ſuſtaining the Perſon of* Sinners, *Judicially*, One with them, and according to the Order of Juſtice liable to their Puniſhment. None of theſe things are required in the Covenant of Grace, taken in ~~their~~ your *ſtrict* ſenſe.

But Dr. *Bates* in Oppoſition unto you, ſaith. "As in *Civil* "Caſes where one becomes *Surety* for another, He is obliged "to Pay the *Debt*, for in the *Eſtimate of the Law*, they are but "One Perſon, *Heb.* 7. 22. So the Lord Jeſus Chriſt, entring "into this Relation, He *ſuſtained the Perſon of Sinners*, and be-"came *Judicially* One with them, and according to the Order "of Juſtice was liable to their Puniſhment. *Harm.* p. 237.

Mr. *W*'s, *Anſw.* 2. "In ſtating the Queſtion, that leads to "theſe Words, I declared what I affirmed concerning Chriſt's "*Surety-ſhip*, and what I did Deny. 1. I granted. He was a *Real* "*Sponſor*, Engaging to do all that belonged to him. Chriſt ac-"cordingly died *in our Nature*, and that not only for our Good: "but in *Our Stead*, *Noſtro Loco*. He was a *Proper* ἀντίψυχος.

S. L. Thus much I ſaw you did expreſly affirm.

Mr. *W*'s. 2. "The thing that I did *deny*, was, that *Chriſt*, by "this Obedience made Attonement for us, as a proper *Pecuniary* "Surety, *in the Law of Works*. This I confuted by ſeveral Ar-"guments.

S. L. 1. Here you give us not the whole you *D*enied, the Place is Man made Righteous, p. 192. and the Words which are *Material*, but *Left* out *by you*, are, "*C*hriſt bound himſelf to "God to give his Life by *D*ying in our *S*tead to ſave ours: *But* "*he was never bound in One Bond with us, that* he ſhould do ſo, *I ſhall* "*give you* a few Reaſons of many.

Theſe are your own words, clearly diſcovering, that your Judgment is, *That Chriſt entred not into the Bond we had forfeited*, which is a Contradiction to Dr. *Bates*, who ſaith, that Chriſt Entred into the ſame Bond, we had Forfeited. *Harm.* page 238.

Mr. *W*'s. 2. "Why did not you take notice of my Granting "*C*hriſt to be a Real *S*ponſor? *&c.*

S. L. The Reaſon why I took no notice of what you granted, was becauſe the Current of your Book going *Another* way, theſe

Paſſages, if we muſt take them in the Orthodox ſenſe, cannot ſignifie leſs, than that you contradict your ſelf. For,

1. As that *State* of *Truth* and *Error*, you ſhewed to your Principal Subſcribers was without any Reference to Dr. *Criſpe*; or to any of the Explications, or Proofs now annex'd to that ſtate in your Books; ſo you roundly without Diſtinction or Limitation, do, in that very ſtate of Truth and Error, Deny a *Change* of Perſons betwixt Chriſt and Believers: And in your *Man made Righteous*, you are expreſs, That Chriſt did not Dye in our Perſon. "It was in our Offending Nature (ſay you) that Chriſt anſwered the Demands of Juſtice, *tho it was not in* our Perſon, p. 58 And in this very ſheet of yours, you Ridicule the Doctrine Embraced by the Reformed about a *Change of Perſons*. You ſay "That it's worth my Leiſure to Conſider how I lay "ſuch ſtreſs on a *Change of Perſons* in *Criſpe*'s Senſe, and yet con-"tend for Chriſt and us being One Perſon. How *could Chriſt*, "*and we be one Perſon in Law, and* yet Chriſt's Perſon, and our "Perſon be mutually changed, unleſs that both Perſons were "changed into a *Tertium Quid*, that neither were before? I anſwer, 1. I lay no ſtreſs on a *Change of Perſon* in Criſpe's Senſe, I did only ſet down your words without any other Remark than Oppoſing to them Dr. *Bates*. Thus,

Mr. *W*'s. "There is no *Change of Perſon between Chriſt and the Elect*, or *between him and believers*, Goſp. Tr. p. 37, 41.

Dr. *Bates*. Our Saviour told his Diſciples, that the Son of man came to give his Life a Ranſom for many, *ἀντὶ* ſignifies a Commutation or Exchange of Things or Perſons; when 'tis uſed with reſpect of Perſons, it Imports a Subſtitution in another's place. *Harm. p.* 245.

Don't you then here unadviſedly Endeavour to wound this *Reverend Doctor* through my ſides, as holding a change of Perſon in *Criſpe*'s *Senſe*? Is this your Reſpect to the *Doctor* to expoſe him thus?

2. About Chriſt's being One Perſon with us in Law, I have not ſaid any thing, but as I delivered the *Orthodox Senſe* in Dr. *Bates* his Words, which are. "And as in *Civil Caſes*, where "one becomes Surety for another, he is obliged to pay the "*Debt*,

" *Debt*, for in the *Eſtimate of the Law*, they are but one Perſon, " *Heb.* 7. 22. ſo, the Lord Jeſus Chriſt entring into this Rela- " tion, he *ſuſtained the Perſon of Sinners*, and became *judicially* " *One with them*, and according to the order of Juſtice was liable " to *their puniſhment*, Harm. *p.* 237.

3. Doth not the *Dr.* here affirm a change of Perſon, that Chriſt ſuſtained the *Perſon of Sinners*, and became *Judicially one with them*; that in the *Eſtimate of Law*, the Surety and the Debter *are one*; And in *pag.* 242, 243. tho' it's *eſſential* to the *nature of puniſhment to be inflicted for ſin*, yet *not on the perſon of the ſinner*: For in *Conſpectu fori*, the Sinner, and Surety are one. How then can you flatter this *Worthy Dr.* to his face, and treat him after this ſort in your Paper?

4. To your Queſtion, How *could Chriſt and we be one Perſon in Law ſenſe*, unleſs *both Perſons were changed into a* Tertium Quid? *Anſw.* What you mean by your *Tertium Quid* I'll not enquire: for whatever you mean by that the driſt of this Paſſage is to expoſe a change of Perſons betwixt Chriſt and us, tho' this change is neceſſary to our being one Perſon with Chriſt in the Eſtimate of the Law.

5. Your aſſerting therefore that Chriſt ſuffered in *our ſtead*, and at the ſame time ridiculing his being One with us in the Eſtimate of the Law, is a plain Demonſtration that you have contradicted your ſelf; and that your ſetled Judgment is moſt different from *Dr. Bates*; and that you differ from the *Lutherans* and *Calviniſts* Univerſally, and from the Learned *Hugo Grotius*, and *Biſhop of Worceſter*, in what is Eſſential to *Chriſt's ſatisfaction*. But

6. Tho' you ſay Chriſt ſuffered in our ſtead, yet 'tis with ſo much Caution, as to admit of the *Socinian*, or at leaſt *Arminian* ſenſe! " The ground of *Dr. Criſp's miſtake* (ſay you) lies " here, becauſe Chriſt ſuffered in *our ſtead*, *that the fruits of his* " *ſuffering might be our Deliverance from ſuffering*, and *our being ſa-* " *ved at laſt*; therefore the *Dr.* thinks there is a change of Perſon, *Goſpel Truth*, *p.* 52. Here then if you take the word [*in ſtead*] in the *Orthodox Senſe*; Suffering inſtead of us, imports a change of Perſon betwixt Chriſt and us; but 2. As you expreſs it, 'tis what the *Socinians* will allow; they do confeſs, that Chriſt

Christ suffered so *for us*, as that the Fruit of his Sufferings might be our Deliverance from suffering. *Crellius* thus far owns that Christ was our Ἀντίλυτρον. And seeing this reaches the Vitals of Christianity, I must and do press it. For what ever you say of Christ's satisfaction; a proper satisfaction there cannot be, where there is not a change of Person in a proper sense; so that Christ and we become one Person in the estimate of the Law.

Mr. *W*'s. "I grant that Christ in taking our Nature, became a "Servant and Subject to the Law of innocency, to its Precepts and "its Punishments as a Mediator, according to the terms adjusted "in the Covenant of Redemption; here I affirm, what he saith, "I deny.

S. L. I never affirmed that you deny Christ was subject to the Law of innocency in it's Precepts, and its Punishments as a Mediator, what I said, was.

Mr. *W*'s: "Tho' in *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. it is said "Christ was made under the Law, it's *not meant* of the Moral but Ceremonial Law, "*Man m. Right.* p. 110.

Dr. *Bates*. The Apostle tells us, *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. Then the fulness of time, *&c.* He took on him our Nature, and Condition, was under the *LAW MORAL* and *CEREMONIAL*, Harm. p. 238.

And did you not say so much?

"Mr. *W*'s. *A.* I propose *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. as an Objection, to which "I made these four Answers. 1. I might shew how the Context "confines to the following sense, *viz.* That Christ was made un-"der the *Jewish Law*, delivered four hundred years after the Pro-"mise, *&c.* And in this sense, it is not a Law of Innocency, as "a proper Covenant of Works, *&c.* the Objection is pretended "hence, but I said the *Jewish Law*, not the *Ceremonial Law*, which "is but part of it. The *Moral Law* was also a part thereof, tho' "not delivered to them as a *proper Covenant* of Innocency.

S. L. You say that the *Context of Gal.* 4. 4, 5. doth *confine* to the sense given by you in your first Answer; and therefore (say I,) exclusive of every other sense, as foreign and remote from the design and scope of the Apostle in this place, which is sufficient to prove you differ from the generality of the *Orthodox*, who

who in the interpretation of this Text ſpeak the ſame with *Dr. Bates.* A confinement to this Senſe, and an extending it to another is inconſiſtent.

"Mr. *W*'s. But I ſaid the *Jewiſh Law*, not the *Ceremonial Law*, "which is but part of it—the *Moral Law* was alſo a part there-"of, tho' not delivered to them as a proper Covenant of In-"nocency.

S. L. 1. Tho' you ſaid the *Jewiſh Law*, yet you alſo ſaid Believers *were ſhut up as* Servants *in Bondage, under the Elements of this World, (viz.)* the Ceremonies, and then add, that in *this ſenſe*, (thatis) in the ſenſe to which (you ſay) the *Context* confines us: *this is not the Law of Innocency, as a proper Covenant of Works, that's meant by the Law, under which Chriſt was made.* What can be more expreſs than that you ſay the Law ſpoken of in this place, under which Chriſt *was made, was not the Law of Innocency, as a proper Covenant of Works*?

2. 'Tis true, you grant that Chriſt became ſubject to the Law of innocency, to its Precepts, and its Puniſhments, *as a Mediator*; and elſewhere you ſay, He *ſuffered in the Perſon of a Mediator*, which you may aſſert conſiſtently enough with your denying that he did endure the Curſe of the *Moral Law as our ſurety*, which is the Point you ſeem to drive at, or at leaſt have ſo *incautiouſly* delivered your ſelf as to occaſion Impartial Readers to ſuſpect ſo much; eſpecially ſeeing in the next place you add.

"Mr. *W*'s. My fourth Anſwer was, Chriſt did not *then* become "a ſurety or undertaker to die for us, *by being made under the* "*Law*; but he was under the Law, becauſe he had undertaken "to die for us.

S. L. 1. Tho' Chriſt was made under the Law, becauſe he had dertaken to be our Surety, and to die for us, yet he became our *Surety, by being made* under the Law.

2. By the Covenant of Redemption he promiſed to be our Surety, die and ſatisfie God's Juſtice, but *became not actually our Surety* till made under the Law. 'Twas impoſſible Chriſt ſhould be our Surety till put into our place and ſtead, that is, till by a *Change of Perſon* he was made under the Law; *what thing ſoever the Law ſaith, it ſaith to them that are under the Law*; Chriſt therefore when born

Rom. 3. 19. *Gal.* 4. 4, 5.

of

of a Woman, was *made under the Law*, that by anſwering all the demands of the Law, he might deliver us from the Law.

3. This fourth Anſwer doth plainly ſhew, that you either miſtake the true notion of a *Surety*, or you do not hold with the Orthodox, that there was a change of Perſon between Chriſt and us; Chriſt made under the Law, and by being made under it, voluntarily and freely entring into the *Bond* we forfeited, became our Surety, and as *ſuch* ſuffered and made ſatisfaction.

Mr. *W*'s. "Chriſt and we are not one in *Conſpectu fori*, and "therefore tells us that it is Blaſphemy to debaſe Chriſt amongſt "the number of Tranſgreſſors. "ANSW. *Not one in Conſpectu* "*fori, is not* in any of my Books, *&c.*

S. L. Tho' this Expreſſion [*Not One in Conſpectu fori*] be not in your Books, you have oft, and [in this very Paper] what is equipollent to it, when you ridicule a change of Perſon, and yet Chriſt and we one with your *Tertium Quid*; And your ſaying it's Blaſphemy to debaſe Chriſt among the number of Tranſgreſſors, is a plain intimation that you hold Chriſt died not *as a Sinner*, nor was in *Foro Poli* as well as in *Foro Soli* conſidered and ſuffered as ſuch, which is a contradiction to the Holy Scriptures, which ſay *he was numbred amongſt Tranſgreſſors*; and to Dr. *Bates*, whoſe words are, "Chriſt ſubmitted to the Law, which made "him appear under the *Character* and *Diſreputation of a Sinner*, "Harm. *p.* 168. That the greateſt ignominy attended Chriſt's "death and that in the account of God and Man, *page* 173. "174.

Voſſius in his defence of *Grotius* affirms, that it's not ſufficient to ſay *Chriſtus mortuus eſt pro nobis*, but *mortuus eſt ut Peccator.*

"Mr. *W*'s. The *Father was never diſpleaſed with Chriſt*, Goſpel "Truth, *pag.* 31. "*Anſw.* I ſaid the Soul of Chriſt endured the "Effects of God's Wrath, and was amazed thereat, but was "*never diſpleaſed with Chriſt.*

S. L. But was there no *Diſpleaſure* in that *Wrath*? Wrath without any mixture of Divine Diſpleaſure is not in a *proper ſenſe* the Wrath which was included in the *Curſe of* the Law; but *Dr. Bates*, the anguiſh of Chriſt's Soul was *immediately*, (and therefore not only *mediante effectu*) from *Divine Diſpleaſure.*

Mr.

" Mr. *W*'s. It ſeems the *Obiector* would have me ſay with " *Criſp*, that Chriſt was odious unto God, hated worſe than a " Toad, *&c.* becauſe of the filthineſs of ſin upon him.

S. L. I appeal to any man of competent underſtanding, whether it's poſſible for Mr. *W*'s to ſuggeſt from my ſetting Dr. *Bates* his Words againſt him, that I would have him ſay with *Criſp*, that Chriſt was odious unto God, *&c.* unleſs he ſuppoſes *Dr. Bates his words* to *ſignifie* the ſame with *Criſp*'s. Had I expreſſed Dr. *Bates* his ſenſe in my own words, there would have been more reaſon for this ſuggeſtion, but that Dr. *Bates* his own Words ſhould meet with ſuch an aſperſion from Mr. *W*'s, I muſt ſay, 'tis unrighteous, as well as indecent and ungrateful.

Mr. *W*'s. " All communications of comfort could not be inter- " rupted, whilſt the Perſonal Union remained, *Goſpel Tr.* p. 33. " *Anſw.* My Words are, this Union could not be diſſolved, nor " could all Communications of Comfort *or ſtrength*, from the Di- " vine Nature be interrupted. He leaves out *or ſtrength*, and " changeth a *Diſjunctive Propoſition into an* Abſolute.

S. L. 1. The Charge you load me with here is, that I leave out [*or ſtrength*] and change a Disjunctive Propoſition into an Abſolute.

2. But what if I have done ſo? have I gone beſides the Rules of Logick? Not at all. For as in a *Diſjunctive* there are two ſimple Propoſitions, ſo it's impoſſible to try whether the Diſjunctive Propoſition be true, any otherwiſe than by aſſuming one of the Parts, which you call a change of the Disjunctive into an abſolute.

3. It's true, if either of the parts of which the Disjunctive is compoſed be true, it's ſufficient to denominate the Disjunctive Propoſition to be true. *Ad veritatem diſjunctivæ Propoſitionis ſufficit alteram partem eſſe veram*; However it's as certain that if one of the parts be true, the other muſt be falſe; for *Partes enunciationis Diſjunctivæ debent eſſe immediate oppoſitæ*; For example ſake, it is day or night, if either part be true, the Disjunctive Propoſition formally conſidered can't be falſe; but it's as true, that if it be day it can't be night; and if this part [*it is now day*] be true, the oppoſite [*it is now night*] is *falſe*.

4. If then this *Proposition* [All Communications of Comfort, or *Strength* from the *Divine* Nature could not be Interrupted while the Union Remained] be *Disjunctive*, the *Parts* of it must be [*Comfort* [or] *Strength*] as Immediately opposed to each other. If there be no Opposition between the *Parts* of a *Disjunctive Proposition*, it's *Nugatory*; if not Immediately opposite, 'twill be *False*.

5. To illustrate this by an Instance. Justification is either by Works or by Faith, not by Works, therefore by Faith. The *Disjunctive Proposition* considered as such is True, if either of the *Parts* be so; but if One of them be true, the other is false, because Immediatly Opposed to each other.

6. To apply this. All *Communications of Comfort were Interrupted, or all Communications of Strength*, But not all Communications of Strength, therefore all Communications of Comfort.

7. But take it which way you will, I am Content; But then however you take it, 'twill unavoidably follow, that you do either contrary to your avowed Principle affirm Christ to be deprived of all Communications of *Strength*, by denying an Interruption of all Communications of Comfort, while the Union Remains; Or, by averring, that all Communications of Strength were not Interrupted, you must hold that all Communications of Comfort were.

8. The first is your express meaning, as you have fully shewn by insisting on an Abatement only of *Degrees* of those *Delightful* Communications.

9. But how is it that Strength and Comfort are one while immediately opposed to each other, as if on the *Presence* of the One, the Absence of the other becomes necessary, which is the Import of your making the *Proposition Disjunctive*, and yet with the same breath you make Comfort a necessary Ingredient of Strength?

10. It would, I think, have been more for your Purpose to have made [*Or*] Conjunctive and Exegetical, and add [*Strength*] by Way of Explication, only then Strength must be necessary unto Comfort, contrary to what you say in this *Paper*, in which you make a sort of Comfort necessary to Strength, wherein it must be acknowledged you *Differ* from the Orthodox, and particularly

Copulative

ticularly from *Dr. Bates*, for ſtill you hold that all Communications of Comfort could not be Interrupted, whilſt the Union Remained; and the *Dr.* is moſt expreſs, that Chriſt felt no Refreſhing Emanations, and that the Light of Joy was *Totally* Eclipſed.

Mr. *W's.* "Calling God *Creditor* and Sin *Debts* is *Metaphorical*, and uſing ſuch Words as *Proper*, hath given advantage to "the *Socinians*. *Anſw.* I acknowledge it, and ſuch as underſtand the Way of Confuting the *Socinians*, are of the ſame "mind.

S. L. 1. You have made a *Miſreport* of your own Words, which as I Delivered them were thus, "The *Improperneſs* of Calling God *Creditor*, *and Sin Debts* otherwiſe than *Metaphorically* "I have ſpoken to. The *Socinians* have ſuch an advantage by it, "*That all Men, who underſtand the true Way of Oppoſing them, "Quit theſe Terms.* Man made Right. *page* 120. look back to *page* 92.

2. It's on theſe laſt words (which you left out) that I inſiſt, having Read many, who underſtand the *true way of Confuting* the *Socinians*, uſing them, Tho' they uſe not theſe Terms in a Rigid, Strict Senſe, nor conſider God *only* as a *Creditor*, yet in their oppugning the *Socinian* Adverſary, they *Quit them not.*

3. If *Dr. Bates* amongſt the Many Learned Writers of this Day, may be allowed by you to underſtand the true way of Oppoſing *Socinianiſm*, he will be found to be againſt you, and if you would carefully conſult him, you might learn that the uſe of theſe terms might be without giving the leaſt advantage unto the *Socinians*. "Chriſt (ſaith he) with the Allowance of the Su"preme Judge Interpoſed as our *Surety*, and in that Relation was "made liable to *Puniſhment*. *Sins* are by *Reſemblance* call'd "*Debts*. As a *Debt* obliges the *Debter* to *Payment*; *So Sin* "doth the Sinner to *Puniſhment*; And as the *Creditor* hath a "Right to Exact the *Payment* from the *Debtor*, ſo God hath a "Right to Inflict *Puniſhment* on the Guilty. *N. B. But with this Dif*"*ference, the Creditor by the mere ſignification of his Will may Diſ*"*charge the Debtor, for he hath an Abſolute Power over his Eſtate,* "*whereas Publick Juſtice is concerned in the Puniſhment of the Guilty.* Harm. *p.* 237.

Mr. *W's.* "Christ can be *bound* by the Covenant of which he is "a Surety to no more than what we are Engaged to do and "Suffer by the Gospel Covenant. *Man made Right.* p. 105. "*Answ.* Lastly He *stops just at the Words* which confute his whole "Imputation, *viz.* That Christ was Engaged by the Covenant "of Redemption to Suffer, *&c.*

S. L. 1. What! Have I made such an Hault? Then surely I may be justly blamed for *Partiality*; This therefore must not Escape our Examination.

Let us then Look into the whole of what I Omitted, which we find to be this. "It is true by the Covenant of Redemption, "he was engaged to suffer Death in the Humane Nature for Sa-"tisfaction; And this in our Place; And also to Obey the "whole Law, and both for the Salvation of his Seed. But *in* "*that Covenant he was Principal*; for God never Obliged us to "Redemption-Work, either by our Selves, or by any Other; "And *therefore Christ here is what the* Civilians *call an* Expro-"missor. He is Obliged alone, tho' he Acts for Another.

S. L. 1. I'll not at this time make any Remark on your *Foisting* in the Word [*Pecuniary,*] but passing this by, it's very Manifest, that as you distinguish between the Covenant of Grace, and the Covenant of Redemption, and grant Christ to be a Surety in the One and an Expromissor in the other, so you will not allow him to *be a Surety in the Covenant of Works.*

2. In the Covenant of Redemption, Christ Engaged to be our Surety, and the Father accepted of his undertaking, and in Pursuance of this Agreement, God the Son was *Born of a Woman, and* Made *under the Law*, He was a Surety in the Covenant of Works; He entred into that Bond we forfeited; Payed Our Debt, and Satisfied for our Sins.

3. That you may shew us your Skill in the *Civil Law*, as well as you have already done it in *Logick*, you talk of *Christ's being our* Expromissor; but don't tell us what you mean by it, any otherwise than by referring us to what the *Civilians* call *Expromissor*, whereby you Intimate that it's to be taken in the Sense they Use, which we will therefore Consider.

Justinian, in his Institutes, having shewn several ways by which, Obligations *ex Contractu*, or *quasi ex contractu* are Introduced,

duced, doth alſo ſhew, how they may be Diſſolved; And tho' it may be done *Ope Exceptionis*, as well as *ipſo Jure*, he confines himſelf, to the taking away of Obligations *ipſo Jure*, and Reduceth the various modes to theſe Heads, ſaying, "That Obli-"gations are diſſolv'd either *Jure Solutionis*, *Acceptilationis*, *No-"vationis*, or *Contrario Conſenſu*.

1. "*Jure Solutionis* when there is a Real Payment of the Debt; "and it is either *Solutio ejuſdem ab Eodem*, which is ſtrict Solu-"tion; or *Solutio Equivalentis Loco Ejuſdem* by another; and then "'tis *Satisfaction*.

2. "*Acceptilationis* when the Payment is only Imaginary, and "not Real.

3. "*Novationis* which is when by the Intervention of a New "Perſon, a new Obligation doth Ariſe, the Old being there-"upon Diſſolved. It is a Transferring of a former Debt into "another Obligation, either Civil or Natural, whereby, he "who was firſt under the Obligation, now ceaſeth to be ſo. "And it is either by *Delegation*, or *Specifick Novation*. *Delega-"tion* is, when a *Debtor* placeth another in his Stead, who "conſents to take on him the *Debt*, and ſtand bound to the "*Creditor* for him, by whom he was *Delegated*.

Under *Novation*, an *Expromiſſor* falls, who becomes obliged for another *Animo Novandi*, *Expromiſſor dicitur qui pro alio Novandi animo Promittit*, which is when I ſtipulate with *Titius* for the ten Pounds *Seius* oweth me *Animo Novandi*, whereby the Obligation by which *Seius* ſtood bound is *Diſſolved*, and now *Titius* only is bound for the *Debt*.

The Difference between an *Expromiſſor*, and *Fide-Juſſor* lieth in the following Particulars: An *Expromiſſor* is alone in the Obligation. A *Fide-juſſor* ſtands bound with another. An *Expromiſſor* is the Principal Debtor; A *Fide-juſſor* is an Acceſſory *Debtor*. An *Expromiſſor* freeth him for whom he Engageth on the firſt Undertaking; A *Fide-juſſor* doth not ſo, till the *Debt* be Paid, both ſtand obliged in the ſame Bond.

If then Chriſt be what the *Civilians* call an *Expromiſſor* in the Covenant of Redemption, the Old *Bond*, that is, the Covenant of Works hath loſt its Obliging Force and Efficacy, and the Sinner, under no Bond at all; for Chriſt is the *Principal* and Only *Debtor*, for which reaſon *Grotius* moſt Excellently, *Non*

eſt

Grot. de Satisf. cap. 6. p. 122. *est ergo hic Acceptilatio, non est etiam Solutio rei ipsius Debitæ, quæ ipso facto Liberet; Non est etiam Novatio aut Delegatio; neq; enim post nos Liberatos aliud simile Debitum, aut Debitor aliis succedit: Sed est Remissio antecedente Satisfactione.*

However to Express One Part of the Mystery of Christ's Satisfaction, namely, that *the Old Testament Believers were actually received into Glory before Christ's Incarnation*, our Divines have rather used the Word *Expromissor*, than *Fidejussor*; but not as the *Civilians* use the Word, such an *Expromissor* they Oppose for the same reasons you do a *Pecuniary Surety*, as may be seen in *Turretine*, *Quamvis Christum* Expromissorem *dicamus*; *non ideo Volumus esse merum* Expromissorem, *vel* Juridicam *hic factam esse Novationem, quæ in variis differt a Sponsione Christi, potissimum quoad Omnes partes alterius fieri, &c.*

Turret. Instit. Theol. *Part* 2. *Loc.* 12. *Quest.* 9. § 17. *p.* 269.

Moreover, An *Expromissor* is a *Pecuniary* Undertaker for Another, who is thereon Discharged the Debt, Ay, tho' the *Expromissor* never Pay a farthing. Have you not then well mended the matter by your opposing a *Pecuniary Surety* in the *English*, and Pleading for him in the *Latin Tongue*?

Besides, A *Pecuniary Fidejussor*, *or Surety* is as Great a Guard against *Antinomianism*, and a greater against *Socinianism*, than your *Expromissor*, for the Liberation results as Immediately from Christ's being our *Expromissor*, as from his being our *Pecuniary Fidejussor or Surety*, and a Freedom ariseth Immediately from the *Expromission* tho' no satisfaction be made; but there can be no Liberation by a *Pecuniary Fidejussor* without satisfaction. Once more, when you Deny Christ to be our *Surety* in the same *Bond* we forfeited, and yet a *Principal* in the Covenant of Redemption, yea a *Principal Debtor*, for so an *Expromissor* is; he is not only a Principal Undertaker, but on that Undertaking, he is the *Principal and Only Debtor*; you do not hereby escape any One *Antinomian* Rock, but you are in great danger of being Lost on the *Socinian* shore, and have supplied Men of that name, with various Arguments against your own *Expromissor*.

Mr. *W*'s. "His Flying Charge from the Premises, as if Socinianism were Abetted, Deserves no further *Reply* than to call "it

" it Slanderous. All my Arguments against Christ's *Pecuniary* " *Suretyship*, he never read in any Book; And had a *Socinian* " urged them against a Truth, they are not less valid, if Urged " against Errors Destructive *of Christianity*.

S. L. 1. Really, Sir, You here put me hard to it, for I must either silently bear the Brand of a *Slanderer*, Or contrary to the Earnest Desire of a Learned and Reverend Brother, your Friend, and against my own Inclination shew that some Parts of your Books are too like unto the *Socinians*.

2. What if I have not read all your Arguments against Christ's Pecuniary Suretyship in *Socinian* Books; Is it not too much for me to shew, that I have read any there?

3. As One under Apprehension you Insinuate that a Socinian may bring your Arguments against a Truth; and then add *That can't make 'em less valid, if urged against Errors* Destructive of Christianity, And I say so too; Only must tell you. 1. That hereby you suggest as if the Men, you Write against, did hold Errors *Destructive of Christianity*, which is an Unjust Slander. 2. That the *Socinian* urgeth them against the very thing you do. They first frame a Chain of Consequences, which in their Fancy flow from the *Doctrines* Embraced by the *Reformed*, then charge them upon Us, even as you have done with some of your Brethren. But,

4. Why did you make the Intimation of *Socinianism* thus Publick? Mr. *Humfrey* (who Published what he did without my Knowledge) carefully concealed *that Part* from the World; and 'twas my Resolution to have Confin'd all *Debates* of it amongst our selves; and tho' you have made it Necessary that I speak *somewhat*, that the World may see I *Slander* you not; yet I will be as sparing as possible I can, Charitably hoping, that however it comes to pass, you are more sound than your *Books*; for in them the Agreement with *Socinians*, in some things Peculiar, is too Exact, and Full.

The very Objections you bring against Christ's *Suretyship* in the *Covenant of Works*, are in a manner *Verbatim* the same, the *Socinians* urge against Christ's Satisfaction, as will appear by a Proposing what the *Socinians* say in *Latine*, with an Addition of yours in *English*, which so exactly correspond with theirs, that it may serve as a just *Translation* of them. *Obj.*

Obj. 1. That *where a Proper Satisfaction* is made, there is no *Room for the Pardon of ſin*——So *SMALCIUS* in the Name of the *Socinians*. "*Si Remiſſio eſſe Debiti*, Solutionem nullam Exigendam fuiſſe: *Adverſa enim fronte pugnant*, Remittere Debitum, "& Solutionem Exigere.

Smalc. de Satisf. cap. 2. p. 191.

Mr. *W's.* "This is Evident, for if my Surety be bound with "me to a Creditor for a thouſand Pounds, if my Surety pay, as "my Surety, this thouſand Pound, the Creditor forgives me no-"thing, I pay him all. *Man made Right.* p. 96.

Smalcius. "*Tantum enim vulgarem illam Cantilenam canit* Smig-"leicus, Remiſſionem eſſe reſpectu noſtri, quibus peccata gratis "Remiſſa, Solutionem vero reſpectu Chriſti. *Sed haret hic* "Smigl. *nimis turpiter—Nam ſi Deus nobis remiſit Debita, interim a* "*Chriſto ſolutionem eorum Exigit, non remiſit Debita: Satisfactum* "*enim eſt illi pro nobis: Sed tantum modus Exigendi novus oſtenſus* "*eſt, ubi ſup.*

Mr. *W's. Obj.* "God may be ſaid to forgive us, being he ad-"mitted Chriſt to be a Pecuniary Surety, tho' we *Pay* by him. "*Anſw.* This goes a little way towards forgiveneſs—It ſounds "low to hear a *Creditor* ſay, you were bound to me for a thou-"ſand Pounds, which I was paid by One that I allowed to be "your *Surety*, and becauſe, *I would take it from you by him, I for-*"*gave you*, tho' I got from you Legally by your Surety every "farthing of your Debt. *This is not Forgiving*; and ſuch a "change, whilſt the very Debt in kind is paid, is not an abate-"ment. Obj. *God procured Chriſt to be our Surety, and therefore* "*he forgave us.* *Anſw.* In Solution of Money this "will not amount to *forgiveneſs*: If one owes me "ten Pounds, for which I caſt him in Priſon; "and finding him Inſolvent, do I forgive him, "If I get one that wiſheth him well, to pay it for him? I befriend "him, but am paid all my ſelf, even by him in *his Surety*, *with-*"*out Forgiving.*

Man made Right. p. 96, 97.

The Second Objection. If *Chriſt did in a proper ſenſe* make a ſatisfaction, then they for whom it is made, are Diſcharged Immediately from Wrath, and have a Title to the Reward. To Require *Terms to Intereſt them in theſe Benefits is* Unjuſt.

Before

Before I give you the Words of the *Socinians*, I must beſeech you to obſerve, that the *Change of Perſon* you Oppoſe is ſuch as Infer's *Chriſt and Us to be One Perſon in the Eſtimate of the Law*, whereby it may be truly ſaid, we *ſuffer'd in Chriſt*, and ſatisfied in him. On this you inſiſt, as if none held thus but the *Antinomians*, whereas it's generally ſo Expreſſed by the *Lutherans*, and by many *Calviniſts*, tho' with ſome otherwiſe.

That it may be ſaid we Suffer'd in Chriſt, is the Import of that Aſſertion, which ſaith, That *Chriſt ſuffer'd as our Surety, and is allowed of* by Mr. *Baxter*; and Biſhop *Hopkins*, affirms, "That all Chriſt hath either *Done*, or *Suffer'd* for the Redemption "of the World, would be altogether in vain, "as to our Particular Benefit and Advan- "tage, were it not that Faith Entitles us un- "to it, and makes that Satisfaction *which he* "*hath given to Divine Juſtice to be* Myſtically our Act, as it was "*Perſonally* His, Expoſ. on Lord's Prayer, *p.* 103. And in his Catechiſtical Expoſition, he ſaith, "That tho' Believers are not "*Perſonally* Appointed to Puniſhment, *they* have already Suf- "fer'd in Chriſt their *Surety*, with whom they are made *One* by "Faith. *p* 237.

It is not ſo aptly ſaid He Satisfied, as that he Suffered in the Perſon of a Sinner. Mr. *Baxter Cath. Theol. par.* 2. *page* 79.

But Mr. *Rutherford*, Celebrated for his Learning and Piety, and ſoundneſs in the Faith, throughout *Scotland*, and the Reformed Churches abroad, Eminently known for his Impregnable Confutation of *Antinomian* Errors; and particularly for his Oppoſition to Dr. *Criſpe*; ſaith, "That we Legally in *Chriſt* "*Satisfied*; Our Nature in Chriſt was Crucified, and *We*, tho' "not born, did *ſatisfie* and *ſuffer Satisfactory Puniſhment* in Chriſt. *Rutherf. of the Covenant of Life Open'd*, Part 2. Cap. 4. p. 257.

Againſt this *Smalcius* thus Argues. "*Non* "*opus eſt requirere ab hominibus Pœnitentiam* "*ſi ſatisfactio fuit accepta pro peccatis illorum.* "*Nec probabile eſt, Conditiones præſcribi poſſe ei,* "*pro quo* plene Satisfactum eſt; *Jam enim, Creditor tenetur ei* "*Debitum remittere & non curare quomodo ſe in poſterum geſturus ſit.* contra Smigl.

Smalc. contr. Smigl. ubi ſup. *cap.* 11. *p.* 286.

To the ſame Purpoſe *Crellius* againſt *Grotius ad cap. 6. p.* 135.

Mr. *W*'s. "If Christ be a strict Pecuniary Surety, what can "be said against our being Justified *Actually before we believe*? "For if we *Satisfied* the *Law* in Christ, how can our Justification "be Suspended, *till we believe*, unless there be some "other Law? The Law acquits *Us*, as soon as the "Condition is performed by us. *Obj.* We *do not* "*apply Christ to our selves before Faith.* *Answ.* 1. But "God by the Law applies him to Us, if we have satisfied it; "and he hath applied him already, in making him our Money "Surety, the Law will execute it self, whether we apply or no. "2. When the Conditions are performed by us, it's against "the Law to deny us the Reward; Or at least to "continue us under the Curse a Moment: Yea, *or* "*to Injoyn any terms on us*, for possessing the Reward; "besides its own Conditions, which are fulfill'd by us; the *Lay-*"*ing Guilt on our Persons any Time is Unjust.*

Man made Right. *p.* 99.

Ubi sup.

Here then you see, How Exact the Agreement is between your Self and the *Socinians*, and how Opposite to Mr. *Rutherford* and all those *Calvinists*, that go the same way. We satisfied in Christ (saith Mr. *Rutherford.*) But this (say you) is to make a Discharge of the Sinner to Result Immediately from Christ's Sufferings, before Faith.

In this second Objection, you are not (I confess) alone with the *Socinians*, for you have in Company the *Arminians*, so Mr. *Rutherford*, "The *Arminians* Deny, that we paid our *Debts to* "*God in Christ*, *Paying them for us.* —And since the *Arminians* "deny, that we paid to Justice a *Ransom* for sin because our Sure-"ty Christ paid for us, They must deny that *Christ was wounded* "*for our Transgressions, &c. Ubi sup.* 248, 249. and in the 256 *page.* He answers your Objection in these words. "When *Arminius* "saith, that the Lord can *Nullo Jure*, by no Law, nor Justice "crave of us Faith, and Conversion to God, if we *have paid our* "*Debts by rigour of Justice* exactly to God in Christ, who *Le-*"*gally* in our stead and place paid for us, he supposes plainly, "that God requires Faith and Obedience of us, as a *part of Re-*"*compence* made to *Offended Justice.* And *Arminius* saith that "Christ's Righteousness is ours, not *as performed by him*, but as "Imputed to us by Faith: So that Faith comes in as a Collateral "Price

" Price paid for us, as a part of the Price, the very *act* and *work* of " Believing being counted ours, and our Righteouſneſs before God.

My Third Inſtance ſhall be what you ſay of the change of the *Sanction of the Law*.

" Mr. *W*'s. Obj. There is a *change of the Penal Sanction of the* " *Law. Pref. Goſpel Truth.* Anſw. This Clauſe is *falſe repreſented*: " I will recite my words; after I had ſaid the Goſpel includes " the *Moral preceptive part of the firſt Law*, &c. And that the " Goſpel is taken in a large ſenſe, when I ſay it includes the " *Moral Precepts*. But yet the Goſpel doth ſo, and they are the " Commands of a *Redeemer*, as well as the Law of a *Creator*. I " then added, the Goſpel hath *another Sanction*, than the Cove- " nant of Works had: tho' nothing be *abated* in the Rule of " Sin, and Duty, yet Bleſſings are promiſed to *lower Degrees of* " *Duties*; and a continuance in a ſtate of Death, with a *bar* to the " *Bleſſing*, are not threatned againſt every *Degree* of Sin, as the " Covenant of Works did; doth it threaten Damnation, or a " continuance therein on any true Penitent Believing Godly Man, " becauſe he is imperfect? Sir, judge you, is a Change *of the* " *Penal Sanction of the Moral Law, the ſame as, the* Goſpel hath a- " nother Sanction to the preceptive part of the Law.

S. L. 1. I will not contend with you at this time about your Enquiry, *whether a* change of the Penal Sanction of the Moral Law, *is the ſame as, the* Goſpel hath another Sanction to the *Preceptive part of the Law*; I will refer it to the Perſon you appeal to for the deciſion, and ask but conſonantly, whether there be a parity of Reaſon between an *old and new Sanction*, and an *old and new Covenant*, the new vacating the old? I will here obſerve:

2. That you in this place ſpeak as if the *Penal Sanction of the Covenant* of Works were *changed*; for when you ſpeak of it, you ſay, the Goſpel hath another Sanction than the Covenant of Works had; and the Goſpel *doth* not threaten a remedileſs damnation, as the Covenant of Works did. If the Penal Sanction of the Law of Works be not changed, but ſtill in force, why not [*hath* and *doth*] inſtead of [*had*, and *did*?] The reaſon of this change of words muſt be becauſe tho' the Law of Works *had a Sanction*, now it *hath* not; tho' it did threaten, now it doth not.

3. But will you ask me, *where is it that you do make expreſs mention of a* Change, for you preſs it, that the Goſpel may have

another Sanction without a *Change*. If a *Change* then of the *Sanction* be found in your Writings, then undoubtedly my Repreſentation is not falſe. We will then try whether we can in your Writings find the mention of *a* Change of the Sanction, for you ſuggeſt as if we could not; to what purpoſe elſe is your Query? Is the *Change* of the ſanction of the *Moral Law*, the ſame as, the Goſpel *hath another Sanction*, &c. Well, ſuppoſe there may be another Sanction without a change, yet a change there can't be, but my Repreſentation muſt be true.

Now, Sir, on enquiry, I find that the very next words to your ſtop, ſpeak of a Change of the Sanction. It is in the ſixth page of your Preface to *Goſpel Truth*, and the twentieth Line. *This* Change of the Sanction (ſay you) *ſuppoſeth the death of Chriſt*, and *his honouring the Law by his perfect obedience*, &c.

Here you ſpeak of a change of the Sanction of the Law, unto which, the Lord Chriſt rendred perfect obedience, which is as much as if you had ſaid, there is a change of the Sanction of the Law of Works, tho' it be in it ſelf unchangeable, yet you ſay it is changed, how elſe could the change of it ſuppoſe Chriſt's Death?

I know not how words can more plainly expreſs a thing than yours do expreſs a change of the Sanction of the Law, which you ſay ſuppoſeth the death of Chriſt. And how could you forget that you had ever written theſe words? Or how could you read what you have tranſcribed out of this page, and not ſee theſe words which immediately follow the place you ſtop at?

Having then found a change of the Sanction of that Law which Chriſt honoured by his perfect obedience, I muſt tell you, that herein you have left Mr. *Baxter*, gone beyond Mr. *Humfrey*, and fallen in with the Socinians; for according to this Notion of yours, the *Old ſevere Law is vacated*, and a more eaſie erected in ſtead thereof, which is an errour peculiar to the Socinians and their kindred.

Crell. Seu Volkel. de Deo & Attrib. *Lib.* 1. *Cap.* 23. in Reſponſ. Mares. *p.* 285.

" Thus *Crellius*, *ſub Evangelio ſuſtulit ſeve-*
" *riſſimam illam Legis Moſaicæ ſanctionem. Ma-*
" *ledictus omnis*, *qui non Perſeverat in Omnibus*
" *quæ ſcripta ſunt in Libro Legis*, (Gal. 3. 10.
" *ex* Deut. 27. 26.) *loco ejus hanc Reponens:*

" *Qui*

" *Qui non credit, nempe in Dei filium,* (Marc. 16. 16. Joh. 3. 18, 39.)
" *condemnabitur.*

" God hath under the Goſpel *removed* that moſt ſevere Law of
" *Moſes*, which ſaith, *Curſed is every one that continueth not in the*
" *Book of the Law to do them*, (Gal. 3. 10. *out of* Deut. 27. 26.)
" and *another requiring Faith*, on pain of Damnation, is put into
" its place.

The ſame is held by you in your affirming a *Change of the Penal Sanction*, whereby the Curſe is not againſt every ſin, only againſt *final unbelief* and *impenitence*, as you expreſs it in the ſecond part of your Anſwer to my *Repreſentation.*

But I beſeech you to conſider that the Commination of the Law is really *unchangeable*, and remains in its full force, threatning the leaſt ſin with eternal Death, whereby the defects of our Faith and other Graces deſerve Hell, which make freſh applications to the blood of Chriſt for Pardon always neceſſary. For this conſult Mr. *Baxter*; " Nature declares Puniſhment to
" be due to ſin; yea to all ſin, the Penalty not totally nullified,
" but made *Remediable* by the *Conditional Covenant of Grace.*
" q. d. [*Thou ſhalt perfectly obey me for the time to come, and every*
" *ſin ſhall deſerve everlaſting Puniſhment, ſo far as that I might juſtly*
" *inflict it, and will do it, if it be not remitted*] Cath. Th. Part 2.
" Sect. 2. Page 29. 31. Once more, I doubt not, ſaith Mr.
" *Baxter*, but the very culpable defect of love to God, and other
" holy qualifications defileth our beſt Works with ſin; and *every*
" *ſin deſerveth ſome degree of a Hell*, according to the Law of In-
" nocency: But if they mean 1. That good Works as ſuch are
" not ſin; 2. Or that our Infirmities are not ſuch as to which
" the Law of Grace threatneth hell, and will condemn us; we
" are then of their mind, but *we miſlike their words:* For *were*
" *there not an antecedent deſert of hell, and a ſinfulneſs ſo deſerving*
" (tho' not by an unremediable guilt) *there would be no need of*
" *Pardon*, Cathol. Theol. Part. 3. page 270.

" Mr. *W*'s. This *Change of the Sanction ſuppoſeth the Death of*
" *Chriſt, and his honouring the Law by his perfect Obedience.*

S. L. The *Socinians* do in like manner aſſign the *Change of the Sanction to the death* of Chriſt. So *Crellius*, " *Sanctio autem novi*
" *Fœderis in Morte Chriſti Expreſſe Collocari à Sacris Scriptoribus,*
" &

"& *id quidem aptiſſime ſolet*; for which *He* brings ſeveral Reaſons, *Crell. Reſp. ad Cap.* 1. *Grot. de ſatisf.* p. 13.

Theſe, Sir, are the ſofteſt Inſtances Material, that I could pitch upon, to ſhew too cloſe an *Agreement* between ſome parts of your Books, and the *Socinians*. And now to return to the Doctor;

Thus, *Honoured and Reverend Sir*, I have conſidered that part of Mr. *W*'s his Sheet, which moſt nearly relates thoſe *Points*, wherein I aſſigned ſome *Difference* in Doctrinals between your ſelf and him. And I forbear the Recapitulation of them (which was even at my Pen's end to do, becauſe he yet *retains* them) for the ſake of *Peace*, and *fear of exaſperation*. I am

Hampſtead, Auguſt the 2d, 1695.

Sir,
Your moſt humble
faithful Servant,
S. L.

Mr. *Humfrey*,

MR. *Williams* hath appealed to you in one Material Point between us; I pray you in the cauſe of our Brethren, and for accommodation's ſake, to give your Judgment, ſeeing he calls to you for it. The words are theſe, p. 4. *Is a change of the Penal Sanction of the Moral Law*, the ſame as, *the Goſpel hath another Sanction to the Preceptive part of the Law?* There are more words added, but the Queſtion muſt be propoſed without them, becauſe the words added are not (that I can find) in his Books.

Mr. *Lobb*,

I Cannot refuſe your Motion, and Anſwer, *It is the ſame* (as it would ſeem to me) if you add no more. *Another Sanction*, and a *change of the Sanction* is all one. But Mr. *W*'s. adds theſe words, *as thoſe Precepts are taken into the Goſpel*, and goes on; *May not*

not the Law *have its own own Sanction ſtill as a Covenant of works, and yet the Goſpel have another Sanction as a Covenant of Grace, tho' it includes the Moral Precepts as a Rule?* And this turning the Tables, does bring his Judgment and mine to meet.

That the *Threatning* Curſe, or Penal Sanction of the Law, as well as the *Precept*, is not abrogated, or ceaſed, is manifeſt by thoſe words of our Lord; *He that Believeth not is condemned already*, which could not be ſaid, if the Law in its threatning was made void. Now you accuſing him of an errour in ſaying contrary, he denies it. He denies not but it is an errour, and a great one, if he did ſo, but denies that there is any thing in his Books, from whence you can gather he does. He expounds himſelf otherwiſe, and what his Judgment, when he wrote, was, himſelf only knows.

It muſt be acknowledged that Mr. *W*'s Conceptions ſeem not to me ſo plain, and clear in this Point, as the *Common Doctrine*, which is Preached and received. Every man (according to this common Doctrine) who is an Unbeliever, or an unſound Believer, is under Condemnation, and the Law conſequently as to the Penal Sanction muſt be in force: But when a man comes to be a Believer, ſay our Divines (as *Rutherford*, to name one) He is no longer *under the Law*, but *under Grace*, according to the Apoſtle, *there is no condemnation to them that are in Chriſt Jeſus.* And for this reaſon, becauſe he is not under the Law, every ſin doth not condemn him, and his duty is accepted, tho' imperfect. If Mr. *Williams* by this Phraſe of his, that *the Goſpel hath another Sanction to the Preceptive part of the Law*, underſtands the Apoſtle's *not under the Law*, and ſays the ſame thing, it is a Phraſe I doubt, not uſual in others.

As for the Queſtion, how, or how far we are freed or redeemed from the Law, it is not moved; but what I have ſaid in a little does ſtate the Point, diſtinguiſh the *Duty* and the *Condition* of the Law, and Goſpel. Perfect obedience is ſtill our *Duty*, but it is not required as the *Condition* of Life and Salvation, when a Man believes he is brought from under the *Condition* of the *Law* to the *Condition* of the Goſpel: This our Divines mean, in that trite Determination, we are freed from the Law, not *quà Regula*, but *quà Fœdus*, and by *quà Fœdus* they expound mainly to be

quoad

quoad Justificationem, & quoad Legis Rigorem; which two Points in short speak at once all these words following: *Tho' nothing be abated in the Rule of Sin, and Duty, yet Blessings are promised to lower degrees of duty, and a continuance in a state of Death, with a bar to the blessings are not threatned against every degree of Sin, as the Covenant of Works did.* Doth *it threaten Damnation, or a continuance therein on any true Penitent Believing Godly Man, because he is imperfect*?

These Words of Mr. *Williams*, and all these words I recite, because they are in his Book, and I do not see that they do determine the Cause between you and him; for here is nothing in them to prove, that he held the Threatning or Penal Sanction of the Law to be still in force, *the face of them looking another way*: Nay, if it be held to be vacated, here is nothing inconsistent with that Opinion. There must be other words then, or Places in his Books, where his Cause must be tried. *By a Man's words he shall be justified, and by his words he shall be condemned.*

Now, Mr. *Lobb*, I have not really Mr. *W*'s his Books, I borrowed them to read, and return'd them; you are to deal faithfully with him and your Conscience; if you find not in him some such words, or the sense of them as signifie a *change* of the Penal Sanction of the Law of works, you have wronged him, and must beg his Pardon. If there be any such words (which one can hardly believe, if the contrary was his weighed judgment when he wrote) then is there here such a fault on Mr. *Williams* his side, as ought indeed to be rebuked; to wit, that there is so much expressed in his Books, out of which you was put to Collect his Errors (and consequently we must account he knew not then that it was an errour,) and yet he should now upon a present explanation pretend you to be false in your *Collection*, and him right in his *Notion*, which your Observation only made him *Correct*.

He appeals here to me as a Judge, I am ignorant what you or he can prove; I profess I know not whether there be any thing of this in his Books or no, I will suppose there is not, because of the open falsehood and impudence otherwise, whereof methinks such a one as he can never be guilty; and therefore I say, Mr. *Lobb*, look to your self, the Cause must come before the Brethren; if they find, that Mr. *W*'s shews that there are no such words, or sense of them in his Books, you fall, you must acknowledge it, and crave Pardon: If they find there are any such words, or sense, then must Mr. *W*'s be honest at last, and confess that there is this Errour in his Book, and that there may be others, which he will *amend*, as soon as he is informed of them, as he has amended this; and there will be an *ingenuous composure*, and an end of all Controversie.

A Paper containing some Points of Difference between Dr. Bates *and Mr.* Williams.

Mr. *Williams.*

'CHrist where he is called a Surety, was a *Surety* of the *Better Testament*, and 'therefore not of the Law of Works, which enjoyned Obedience, and 'Inflicted Death on Sinners, *Heb.* 7. 22.

'It was not the Covenant that obliged Us to die, or perfectly Obey in a way 'of merit, that *here* he is called Surety of. *Man made Right.* p. 102.

'That the Covenant Christ is Surety of, in *this place* is the Gospel-Covenant; 'and if so, he can, even as a Money-Surety, hereby be bound with us, to no 'more than what we are Engaged to do and suffer by this Gospel-Covenant. *Ubi sup.* p. 105.

Dr. *Bates.*

'As in *Civil* Cases, where One becomes *Surety* for another, he is obliged to 'pay the Debt, for in the *Estimate of the Law they are both one Person.* Heb. 7. 22 'so the Lord Jesus Christ entring into this Relation, he *sustained the Person of Sin-* 'ners, and became *Judicially One* with them, and according to the Order of Ju- 'stice, was liable to their Punishment, *Harm.* p. 237. *Edit. tertia.*

'Dr. *Owen.* The Generality of Expositors Antient and Modern, of the *Ro-* 'man, and *Protestant* Churches, Affirm, that the Lord Christ as the *Surety* of the 'Covenant was *Properly* a *Surety* unto God for us, *&c.* on *Heb.* 7. 22.

Mr. *W's.*

'The *Improperness* of Calling God *Creditor*, and Sin *Debts*, otherwise than Me- 'taphorically, I have spoken to: The *Socinians* have such an advantage by it, 'that ALL men, who understand the TRUE Way of opposing them, QUIT 'THESE TERMS. *Ubi sup.* p. 120.

Dr. *Bates.*

'Sins are by *Resemblance* call'd *Debts*, as a *Debt* obligeth the *Debtor* to payment, 'so Sin doth the Sinner to Punishment. And as the *Creditor* hath a Right to Exact 'the Payment from the *Debtor*; so God hath a Right to inflict Punishment 'on the guilty; but with this difference, the *Creditor* by the mere signification 'of his Will may discharge the *Debtor*, for he has an absolute Power over his 'Estate; whereas Publick Justice is concerned in the Punishment of the guilty. '*Ubi supra.* '*Christ* by his *Obedience* and *Death* did fully discharge the DEBT of all 'those that are Justified. *Assembl. Confess. c.* 9. § 3.

Mr. *W's.*

'Christ bound himself to God, to give his Life by dying in our stead to save 'ours; *But* HE WAS NEVER *Bound in* ONE BOND WITH US, that HE 'SHOULD DO SO. *Ubi sup.* p. 92.

'But how follows it, that because he obliged himself in the *Covenant* of *Re-* 'demption, that he would be in our Nature subject to the Law for our Redemp- 'tion; that therefore *He was such a Surety in what he did, as THAT WE LE-* '*GALLY DID, WHAT HE DID, and that in the Estimate, and Sentence of that* 'Law, *as a Law of Works?* It's so far from Concluding this, that it Concludes 'the Contrary. *Ubi sup.* p. 110.

This is in his third answer to *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. which he leap'd over, in his answer to Mr. *Humfrey*

Dr. *Bates.*

'Christ entred into the *Bond* we had forfeited. —— And satisfied the Penalty 'of the Moral Law, as *Our Surety*. Ubi sup. *p.* 238.

'The Lord Christ entring into this Relation, (*viz.* of our *Surety*) he *sustained* 'the *Person* of Sinners, and became *Judicially one with them*, and according to the 'Order of Justice, was liable to *their Punishment*. Ubi sup. *p.* 137.

'Again, Altho' it's Essential to the Nature of Punishment to be Inflicted for 'Sin, yet not on the *Person* of the Sinner, for in *Conspectu fori* the Sinner and 'Surety are *One*. *Ubi sup.* p. 242, 243.

Mr. *W's.*

Obj. "*Christ was made under the Law, to Redeem them, that were under* the Law, 'that we might recieve the Adoption of Sons. *Gal.* 4. 4, 5.

Answ. 1. 'I might shew how the CONTEXT doth Confine to the *following* 'sense, *viz.* Christ was made under the *Jewish Law*, as Delivered Four Hun-'dred years after the Promise, which could not give Life, nor the Spirit; under 'which Law the *Jewish Believers* were shut up, and it their Schoolmaster, and 'they as Servants in *Bondage under the Elements of this World*, *i.e.* the *Ceremonies*; 'and far from the Designed Liberty of Adopted Sons. But Christ was made un-'der *this Law* to Redeem and Rescue those Jewish Believers from THIS BON-'DAGE, and to bring the Gentiles as well as they, and at one Instant with them, 'to the Gospel Freedom and Liberty from the *Jewish Yoak* and *Bondage*, which 'many are still fond of. *Consult* Chap. 3, & 4. In this sense, it's not the *Law of* 'Innocency as a proper Covenant of Works that's meant by the Law under which 'Christ was made. The Law of Works had not in it the Ceremonies, Ordinances, 'and the like. *Ubi sup.* p. 109, 110.

Dr. *Bates.*

'The Apostle tells us, *Gal.* 4. 4, 5. *That when the fulness of Time, came God sent his* 'Son, *made under the Law, that he might Redeem them that were under the Law.* He 'took our Nature and Condition: He was made under the Law *Moral* and *Cere-*'*monial*. The *Directive* part of the *Moral* Law he fulfilled by the Innocency of his 'Life; The *Penalty* he satisfied as our Surety, being under an Obligation to save 'Us. *Ubi sup.* p. 238. Mr. *W's.*

'There is not a *Change of Person betwixt the Elect* and Christ. *Gospel Truth* 'stated, in the state of Truth. *p.* 37.

'The Difference lies in these Points. [*viz.* betwixt Dr. *Crisp*, and him.]

1. 'Whether there be a *Change of Person betwixt Christ* and the Elect, yea, or 'betwixt Christ and Believers. This the Dr. affirms, and I deny. *Ubi sup.* p. 40.

'*There is not a Change of person betwixt Christ and the Elect*, p. 41. The Ground of 'Dr. *Crisp's mistake*, Because Christ suffered in *our stead*, *that the fruit of his suffering* 'might be our DELIVERANCE from Suffering, and our being saved at Last; there-'fore he thinks there is a *Change of Person*, Ubi sup. *p.* 52. so far Mr *W's*. *In Hypothesi autem. h. e. in Christo* Liberatore nostro, *qui* ἀντίλυτρον *nostrum est, id agnoscimus, Nos enim mortem ferre debebamus, ille ut nos ab eâ* Liberaret *mortem sustinuit*, Crell. respons. ad Grot. de satisfact. cap. 8.

Dr. *Bates.*

'Our Saviour told his Disciples, *That the Son of Man came to Give his* Life

'*Life a Ranſom* FOR *many*: ἀντὶ ſignifies a *Commutation*, or *Exchange of Things*, or '*Perſons*: Thus are we commanded to render to none Evil FOR Evil: *And if* '*a Son aſk of his Father a Fiſh, will he give him a Serpent for a* FISH? When 'tis 'uſed with reſpect of *Perſons*, it Imports a *Subſtitution* in *another's place*. *Archelaus* Reigned ἀντὶ Ἡρῴδου, *Mat.* 17. 27. *in ſtead of his* Father *Herod*.

'And *Peter* paid Tribute FOR *Chriſt*, that is, REPRESENTING Him, *Ubi* '*ſup.* p. 245.

Mr. *W's*.

'It is Blaſphemy to debaſe Chriſt amorg their *Number*, who were *Enemies* '*without Strength*, and Sinners, for whom he was the dying Sacrifice. *Goſpel* '*Truth*. p. 33.

Dr. *Bates*.

'' Chriſt was the *Holy Law giver*, yet he ſubmitted to that Law, which made 'Him Appear under the CHARACTER, and DISREPUTATION of a SIN-'NER *Ubi ſup.* p. 168.

'The Greateſt *Ignominy attended Chriſt's Death*, and that in the *Account of GOD*, 'and *Men*. Ubi ſup *p.* 173, 174. ſo far the Dr. And He was Numbred amongſt 'Tranſgreſſors, and bore the ſin of many, ſaith the Prophet, *Iſa.* 53. 12.

Mr. *Ws*.

'The *Father was never diſpleaſed* with Chriſt. *Goſpel Truth*. p. 31. The *Soul* of 'Chriſt endured the EFFECTS of God's Wrath; but was never *diſpleaſed with* '*Chriſt*. *Anſwer to Mr.* Humfrey. p. 5, 6.

Dr. *Bates*.

'The anguiſh of his Soul was not merely from ſympathy with his Body; but 'IMMEDIATELY from *Divine Diſpleaſure*. It pleaſed the Lord to bruiſe him; 'This principally reſpects the Impreſſions of Wrath made upon his Inward man. '*Ubi ſupra*. p. 241.

Mr. *Ws*.

'All *Communications of comfort or ſtrength* from the *Divine Nature* could not be 'interrupted, while the Perſonal Union remained. *Goſpel Truth*. p. 33. That the 'Divine Nature ſuſpended for a while the delightful Communications of it, *as to* '*the* DEGREES it was accuſtomed to emit to the Humane Nature of Chriſt. This 'with Awe I freely affirm. *Ubi ſupra*. p. 32. Becauſe God forſook Chriſt, as to 'USUAL DEGREES OF COMFORT, Dr. *Criſp* thinks, Chriſt was ſeparated 'from God. *Ubi ſupra*. 36.

Dr. *Bates*

'An Impetuous Torrent of pure *unmixed* Sorrows broke into his *holy Soul*: He 'felt NO *Refreſhing Emanations*. *Briefly*, ALL COMFORTING INFLUENCES 'were ſuſpended, but without prejudice to the Perſonal Union, or the Perfection 'of his Grace, or to the Love of his Father toward him. *Ubi ſupra*. p. 172. 'The '*Light of Joy*, that alway ſhined in his Soul, a *ſweet Image* of Heaven was *then* 'TOTALLY *Eclipſed*. God the Fountain of Compaſſion reſtrained himſelf; his 'Father appeared a *Severe*, *Inexorable Judge*, and dealt with him not as *his Son*, 'but *our Surety*. p. 241.

Mr. *Ws*.

'Can any infer, that becauſe Chriſt was made under the Law, in performance of

'his *Prior Engagement* to Redeem loſt Sinners; to which Engagement theſe Sinners 'were never obliged: that *therefore theſe Sinners* DID TRULY *do and* SUFFER '*whatever Chriſt did to redeem and ſave them?* *Man made Light.* p. 111.

Dr. *Bates.*

'Chriſt muſt aſſume the Nature of Man, that he might be put in *his ſtead* in or-'der to make ſatisfaction for him. He was to be our REPRESENTATIVE, there-'fore ſuch a conjunction between us muſt be, that *God* MIGHT ESTEEM ALL HIS PEOPLE *to* SUFFER IN HIM. *Ubi ſupra.* p. 232.

Mr. *Ws.*

'The *Objector* thinks, if I deny the *Criſpian Charge of Perſon*, or Pecuniary Sure-'tyſhip, and *one Legal Perſon*, in a ſenſe inferring our making ſatisfaction, by our 'dying in the *Laws Eſtimate*; Then whatever, I ſay, of Chriſt's Satisfaction, muſt 'be *Socinianiſm*; and all I can utter againſt Socinianiſm is *Self contradicting.* An-'ſwer to Mr. *Humfrey*, p. 7.

Dr. *Bates.*

'Chriſt was to be our Repreſentative, therefore ſuch a Conjunction between 'us muſt be, that *God might eſteem all his People to ſuffer in him*, *ubi ſup.*

Mr. *Rutherford.* 3. 'Arminians deny, that *we paid our* Debts *to God*, *in Chriſt*, 'paying for us So that the *broken man* cannot be ſaid to *have ſatisfied the Debt* in and 'through the *Surety* who ſatisfied for him which in all Law is unjuſt. And ſince 'Arminians deny, that WE PAID to *Juſtice* a Ranſom for Sin becauſe our Surety 'Chriſt paid for us, he muſt deny that *Chriſt was wounded for our Tranſgreſſions*, and 'bruiſed for our Iniquities, or that the *Chaſtiſement of our Peace was upon him*; con-'trary to *Iſa.* 53. 5.

M. *Ws.*

'There is a *Change* of the *Penal* Sanction of the Law. *Treſ. to Goſp. Tr.* That the 'Goſpel Law doth not denounce Death for the ſame ſins, as *Adam's* Law did; 'That Law threatned Death for the leaſt Sin, but the Goſpel threatens Death 'not for *every Sin.* Def. of Goſpel Tr. p. 30.

Mr. *How.*

'For the *Commination* of the Law, we muſt underſtand two things. 1. That for 'every *Tranſgreſſion a proportionable Puniſhment is due.* This is in *ſtrictneſs*, and moſt 'proper ſenſe NATURAL, and therefore *unalterable.* The moſt rigorous De-'terminations of the Penalty ſtand publickly extant amongſt the *Placita* of the 'Redeemer. Of *Bleſſedneſs.* p. 33, 34. Mr. *Alſop* holds *the ſame. Anti-Sozzo.* p 688.

This part of that Paper, referr'd unto by Mr. *Humfrey*, Mr. *Ws.* and *my ſelf*, which relates unto Dr. *Bates* ſomewhat enlarged, I thought meet for the *Reader's* greater help, and ſatisfaction, to make publick: To which I will only add, I am well aſſured, that the CHIEF, if not *All* of thoſe Brethren who Subſcrib'd the Teſtimonial prefix'd to Mr *Ws.* his Book, agree with the *Doctor*, and their *Congregational*, and *Presbyterian* Brethren, holding no more in theſe Points, than what hath been delivered by the *Britiſh* Divines at the *Synod* of *Dort*; And that the *Teſtimonial* to Mr. *Ws.* Books is to be conſidered rather as an *Abhorrence* of *Antinomianiſm*, than an Approval of Mr. *Ws's.* his Notions, who in ſome impor-tant parts of this Controverſie differs from *Amyrald*, Mr. *Baxter*, and Mr. *Humfrey*, as well as from Dr *Bates* and his Brethren.

FINIS.